MR. K. N. PUTTANNA (Chamarajnagar Taluk).—

Q.—28. Will the Government be pleased to answer the following :—

(1) What is the reason for including Aldùru, Navaluru and Ganaganur in the Chamarajnagar Taluk though they are situated 18 to 20 miles from Chamarajnagar and are much nearer to Nanjangud and T.-Narsipur Taluks ?

(2) Why are Dasanur, Thoralli, Chikka Homma and Dodda Homma included in Nanjangud Taluk which is very far though they are very near to Chamarajnagar Taluk ?

(3) Are Government aware that this wrong distribution has caused much difficulty and loss to raiyats in the conduct of Government work ?

(4) If so, where is the hindrance to Government to remove the difficulties of raiyats and include the above villages in the nearer taluks ?

(5) If there is no obstacle, when is it possible to redistribute these ?

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—28. (1) In the case of Aldur and Navalur, the reason is that they are two of the 14 Inam villages endowed to the Sri Chamarajeswara temple all of which are advisedly included in *one* taluk, *viz.*, Chamarajnagar, in order to preserve the integrity of the grant and facilitate unity of supervision and control. It is inexpedient to disturb this arrangement which has been working satisfactorily in the interests of the temple.

In the case of Ganaganur which does not belong to the temple but to a private party, there is no objection to transfer it to the Nanjangud Taluk if the Inamdar and raiyats wish it. The question is under investigation.

(2) The reason is not known. It has been so for a long time.

(3) This is the first time that a representation has been made in the matter to Government.

(4) No hindrance. The whole question of the redistribution of villages of the T.-Narsipur, Chamarajnagar and Nanjangud Taluks so as to suit the raiyats' convenience which was brought up as a subject during the last District Conference, Mysore, is under investigation by the Deputy Commissioner.

(5) As soon as the investigation referred to in the reply to part (4) is completed, this will be considered.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. Puttaswami.—

What is the inconvenience in redistributing these villages ?

Second Member of Council.—

If they are included under one management, it is convenient.

Mr. Veeranna.—

With reference to reply to item No. 2 how long it has been so and what is the reason ?

Second Member of Council.—

Notice is required.

MR. Y. SREENIVASA IYENGAR (Yelandur Jahgir).—

Q.—29. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) Has it come to the notice of Government that Sri Biligiri Rangaswami Hill is a Sarva Inam to Sri Biligiri Rangaswami ?

(2) If so, what are the several items of income from the forest belonging to the Hill ?

(3) Is the amount realised on these items being credited to the Muzrai Fund of the place in the name of God ?

(4) If it is credited to the Muzrai Fund of this taluk, what is the amount collected till the 15th of August 1928, the amount spent and the balance ?

(5) Where is this amount ?

(6) Is the balance invested properly so as to yield interest ?

FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—29. (1) What exactly is the Devadaya grant to the Sri Biligiri Rangaswami temple does not appear to have been clearly defined and it is proposed to have this matter investigated.

(2) to (6) Information cannot be furnished in view of the position stated in answer to (1).